UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,729	04/27/2005	Shigeyoshi Kouno	P27797	8751
7055 7590 09/13/2007 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE		TALBOT, MICHAEL	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	
,				
		•	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

. 1*						
C.	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/532,729	KOUNO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael W. Talbot	3722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ap	<u>oril 2005</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	,					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-15 are subject to restriction and/or expressions. 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the objected to by the Examiner Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction and the objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
	•					
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ıte				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1 and 2, drawn to a Method for performing tapping process in a punch press.

Group II, claims 3-10, drawn to a Tapping device with a tap holder in a punch press.

Group III, claims 11 and 12, drawn to a Punch Press with a rotating mold indexing device for performing rotation indexing of a rotating mold.

Group IV, claims 13-15, drawn to a Tapping device having a tap die for supporting a work piece.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I,II,III, and IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Inventions I and II – the common features are a tap, a rotating mold indexing device and a punch press. These features are not considered "special" with respect to the Tapping and/or Punch art, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

Inventions I and III – the common features are a rotating mold indexing device, a tapping tool and a punch press. These features are not considered "special" with respect to the Tapping and/or Punch art, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

Inventions I and IV – the common features are a tap and a work piece with a prepared hole. These feature are not considered "special" with respect to the Tapping art, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

Inventions II and III – the common features are a rotating mold indexing device and a punch press. These features are not considered "special" with respect to the Tapping and/or Punch art, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

Inventions II and IV – the common feature is a tap. This feature is not considered "special" with respect to the Tapping art, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

Inventions III and IV – there are no common features, and therefore the inventions do not share the same or corresponding "special technical feature".

- 3. A telephone call was made to Mr. William Pieprz on Thursday, 6, September 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. Mr. William Pieprz requested the written Election/Restriction be sent out.
- 4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

Application/Control Number: 10/532,729

Art Unit: 3722

In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

There is an examination and/or search burden for these patentably distinct inventions due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The inventions require a different field of search (e.g. searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention; and/or the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning the content of this communication from the examiner should be directed to Michael W. Talbot, whose telephone number is 571-272-4481. The examiner's office hours are typically 8:30am until 5:00pm, Monday through Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Monica S. Carter, may be reached at 571-272-4475.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at FAX number 571-273-8300. This practice may be used for filling papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filling papers, which require a fee, by applicants who authorize charges to a USPTO deposit account. Please identify Examiner Michael W. Talbot of Art Unit 3722 at the top of your cover sheet.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,729

Art Unit: 3722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner

6 September 2007

Monion S. Carter

Page 5

MONICA CARTER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED